# MONSTER AFF

#### Debate is a fiction. In this discursive setting, students pretend to fiat government agents that exist in what is considered the quote/unquote “real world.” We pretend like we’re policymakers that make real decisions, when in reality all we’re doing is playing make believe. We cast a spell in the debate space to help us visualize and understanding the ramifications of certain actions that agents can take. Like other debaters of the past and present, I will create magic and affirm a fairy tale.

The role of the ballot is to affirm the becoming of sorceresses- this is the only way to break down static identities which key to solving oppression.

Ramey:

Joshua Delpech-Ramey. Deleuze, Guattari, and The Politics of Sorcery. SubStance Vol. 39, No. 1, Issue 121: Spiritual Politics After Deleuze (2010) pp. 8-23. University of Wisconsin Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40801056>. CM

Becoming, for Deleuze and Guattari, is neither the immanent mode of existence ultimately transcended by the Platonic Ideas in which they participate, nor is it the form of oppositional mediation in which Hegel saw the reason of history’s ruse. “**Becomings**,” generally written in the agrammatical plural, **are the multiplicity of experiential states in which lines are blurred** **between human consciousness** and animal awareness, between biopsychic life and the nature of matter itself. What the authors have in mind, in general, are **processes of transformation that issue in** strange, uncanny, or even fantastic hybrids: the **stuff of fictions**, and science fictions, that tell of inconceivable life forms, the “eldritch feralities” of H.P. Lovecraft’s lore. But becomings abound also at the interstices of speciation and phylogenetic variation, even when such mutants exists only in rumors of werewolves, the legends of vampires, tales of she-wolves and ape-men. For Deleuze and Guattari, **becomings accrue at the vanishing point where history and legend meet**, at the twilit horizon where **monstrosities of fiction reveal dynamics that translate the most profound facts of biopsychic life. In becomings, borders between the sexes and the species, groups and individuals, matter and mind grow indiscernible, imperceptible.** Yet such becomings are not vague, and involve definite thresholds. Deleuze and Guattari in fact identify a *series* of thresholds in becoming: becoming- woman, becoming-animal, becoming-molecular, becoming-intense. As one can observe in the ordering of this series, **the movement of becoming is** quite specific: it is **a movement *away* from the stereotypically “male” ego, fixated on its isolated body, paranoid about its fragile identity**, us- ing its reason to defend itself against the world, ***toward* the more supple** and supine flesh and less dualistic **mind of “woman,**” *further* toward the instinctual immanence of the animal, *into* an inhabitation of the depths of vibrational and energetic patterns verging on the white noise of chaos. In literature and anthropology, **reports abound of *sorcerers* who are capable of traversing and operating upon this line of increasing intensity through which the human being ecstatically finds itself capable of powers and affects outside the normal range.**

#### We commodify the different body. We stare at those with disabilities and consider them less than human. We have historically deemed them monsters. The commodification of the disabled body has moved from the freak shows and circuses to the medical community.

**Garland-Thomson:**

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Women’s Studies, Emory University. Disabilities Studies Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 4, *Staring at the Other.* February 2005. Society for Disability Studies. CM

As such, **staring is** **a**n embodied and relational **visual exchange that** carries complex cultural and historical meanings. Like sex and eating, staring **is drenched with significances**, scrupulously **regulated**, **and** intricately **ritualized**. Civility, for example, has always strictly governed staring and prescribed what we do with our eyes in social encounters. In American culture, the one thing everyone knows about staring is that your mother told you not to do it. Both furtive and compelling, **staring is** imagined as a formidable interchange and is **a source of** vivid **narrative** within in the Western cultural archive. **Medusa's stare turned men to stone; the evil eye haunts pervasively**. As ocular-centric modernity developed, myriad institutions lassoed human curiosity by ritualizing the urge to stare at the unexpected. If staring is the effort to make sense of the inexplicable, to craft a narrative of recognition from incoherence, then **the target of staring is often** that which seems **strange or unfamiliar**. In Western history, **the figure of the monster or the freak is** perhaps **the exemplar of the unexpected**, the unfamiliar, the novel. **Monsters and freaks are forms that challenge the status quo of human embodiment.** We have ritualized encounters with such unexpected bodies throughout Western history by staging hyperbolic displays of what is taken to be the extraordinary. From antiquity through modernity, **unusual and inexplicable bodies considered to be monsters and freaks** **have been displayed** by the likes of medieval kings and P.T. Barnum **for entertainment and profit** in courts, street fairs, dime museums, and side shows. In the last two centuries, **medical science has** securely **moved** such **unruly bodies into laboratories, operating rooms, and medical texts in order to establish the borders of the normal and predictable**. Nevertheless, they still leak out to the public in tabloids and horror films. Indeed, **the history of disabled people** in the Western world **is** in part the history of being **on display**, of being visually conspicuous **while being** politically and socially **erased.** Like the word "fascination," a whole vocabulary of words such as "marvelous" and "wonderful" that described the common practice of staring at what I have called extraordinary bodies has faded today into vagueness now that it is considered bad taste to stare at disabled people as a middle class form of entertainment. Monsters, for instance, were congenitally disabled newborns imagined to be omens or messages from the gods. Monstrous bodies were a particular type of prodigy, which were wonderful and awful—in the sense of inspiring wonder and awe—events such as comets and earthquakes. In a pre-scientific world, unexpected and unexplainable occurrences were the maps of truth that had to be read by intense looking. The term "freak" has also been unmoored in the 20th century from its specific original meaning. "Freak" meant whimsical or capricious before today's notion of abnormal highjacked it. A freak was to be stared at because it bore evidence of both "nature's sport" and of God's infinite capacity for mysterious surprise (See Lorraine Daston and Katherine Park, Richard Altick, John Block Friedman, Mary Bain Campbell, Stephen Greenblatt, Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, and Rosemarie Garland-Thomson).

#### The difference of female sexuality has historically been considered unsettling because it is inaccessible to male privilege. This led to the representation of women as monsters.

**Creed:**

Barbara Creed. *The Monstrous Feminine- Film, Feminism, and Psychoanalysis.* Routledge 1993. CM

As well as its expression in surrealist art (see illustrations), the myth of the *vagina denlala* is extremely prevalent. Despite local variations, the **myth** generally **states** that **women are terrifying because they have teeth in their vaginas** **and** that the **women must be tamed or the teeth somehow removed or softened** - usually **by a hero** figure - before intercourse can safely take place. **The witch**, of course, **is a familiar female monster**; she is invariably represented as an old, ugly crone who is capable of monstrous acts. **During** the European **witch trials** of recent history **she was accused of** the most hideous crimes: **cannibalism, murder, castration of male victims, and** the advent of **natural disasters** such as storms, fires and the plague. Most **societies** also **have myths about the female vampire**, a creature **who sucks the blood of helpless**, often willing, **victims** and transforms them into her own kind.∂ **Classical mythology**, too, **was populated with gendered monsters**, many of which were female. The **Sirens** of classical mythology were described as enormous birds with the heads of women. They **used their magical songs to lure sailors close to shore** in order to drive the sailors' ships into hidden reefs. The Sirens **then ate their helpless victims.** The Medusa and her two sisters also presented a terrifying sight. They had huge heads, their hair consisted of writhing serpents, their teeth were as long as boars' tusks and they flew through the air on golden wings. **Men unfortunate enough to look upon** the **Medusa** with her evil eye were immediately **turned to stone**. In classical times, pendants and other jewellery depicting the Medusa's frightening appearance were frequently worn to ward off evil spirits, and war- riors painted the female genitals on their shields in order to terrify the enemy. Freud takes up this point in his short essay, 'Medusa's head':∂ If Medusa's head takes the place of a representation of the female genitals, or rather if it isolates their horrifying effects from their pleasure-giving ones, it may be recalled that displaying the genitals is familiar in other connections as an apotropaic act. What arouses horror in oneself will produce the same effect upon the enemy against whom one is seeking to defend oneself. We read in Rabelais of how the Devil took flight when the woman showed him her vulva.∂ (p. 274)∂ It is not by accident that **Freud linked the sight of the Medusa to the** equally horrifying **sight of the mother's genitals**, for **the concept of the monstrous- feminine**, as constructed **within** by **a patriarchal and phallocentric ideology, is related** intimately **to** the problem of **sexual difference and castration**. If we accept Freud's interpretation that the 'Medusa's head takes the place of a representation of the female genitals', we can see that **the Medusan myth** **is** mediated by **a narrative about the *difference* of female sexuality** as a difference which is grounded in monstrousness and **which invokes castration anxiety in the male spectator.** 'The sight of the Medusa's∂ head makes the spectator stiff with terror, turns him to stone.' The irony of this was not lost on Freud, who pointed out that becoming stiff also means having an erection. 'Thus in the original situation it offers consolation to the spectator: he is still in possession of a penis, and the stiffening reassures him of the fact' (ibid., 273). One wonders if the experience of horror - of viewing the horror film - causes similar alterations in the body of the modern male spectator. And what of other phrases that are used by both male and female viewers- phrases such as: 'It scared the shit out of me'; 'It made me feel sick'; 'It gave me the creeps'? What is the relationship between physical states, bodily wastes (even if metaphoric ones) and the horrific - in particular, the monstrous-feminine?

#### The female and disabled body is considered the abject and represents the ejection of self within horror. This notion of the abject also creates a space in horror and the monstrous for those with disability or a representation of anything considered “deviant”.

**Creed:**

Barbara Creed. *The Monstrous Feminine- Film, Feminism, and Psychoanalysis.* Routledge 1993. CM

The horror film would appear to be, in at least three ways, an illustration of the work of abjection. First, the **horror** film **abounds in images of abjection, foremost of which is the corpse**, whole and mutilated, **followed by an array of bodily wastes** such as blood, vomit, saliva, sweat, tears and putrefying flesh. In terms of Kristeva's notion of the border, **when we say such-and-such a horror film 'made me sick' or 'scared the shit out of me' we are actually** **foregrounding that** specific horror film **as a 'work of abjection'** or 'abjection at work' - almost in a literal sense. Viewing the **horror** film **signifies a desire** not only **for perverse pleasure** (confronting sickening, horrific images! being filled with terror/desire for the undifferentiated) but also **a desire**, once having been filled with perversity, taken pleasure in perversity, **to** throw up, throw out, **eject the abject (from the safety of the spectator's seat)**. In Kristeva’s view, **woman is specifically related to polluting objects** which fall into two categories: **excremental and menstrual**. **This** in turn **gives woman a special relationship to the abject** - a crucial point which I will discuss shortly. Second, **the concept of a border is central to the construction of the monstrous** in the horror film; that which crosses or threatens to cross the 'border' is abject. Although the specific nature of the border changes from film to film, **the function of the monstrous remains** the same - **to bring about an encounter between the symbolic order an**d that which threatens its **stability**. In some horror films **the monstrous is produced** at the border **between human and inhuman,** **man and beast** *(Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, Creature from the Black Lagoon, King Kong);* in others the border is between the **normal and the supernatural, good and evil** *(Carrie, The Exorcist, The Omen, Rosemary's Baby);* **or** the monstrous is produced at the border which separates those who take up their **proper gender roles** from those who do not *(Psycho, Dressed to Kill, A Reflection of Fear);* **or** the border is between **normal and abnormal sexual desire** *(The Hunger Cat People).* Most **horror** films also **construct** **a border** **between** what Kristeva refers to as **'the clean and proper body' and the abject body, or the body which has lost its form and integrity.** The fully symbolic body must bear no indication of its debt to nature. In Kristeva's view **the image of woman's body, because of its maternal functions**, acknowledges its 'debt to nature' and consequently **is more likely to signify the abject** (ibid., 102). The notion of the material female body is central to the construction of the border in the horror film. I will explore this crucial area fully in the following chapters.

#### I advocate that adolescents ought to have the right to make autonomous medical decisions in order to become monsters- it’s time we reject the notion to conform and condemn others for being different.

#### People with disabilities are accused and persecuted for witchcraft- let us take back this identity as a form of power.

Igwe:

Leo Igwe, Child Witch Killings and Africans. James Randi Educational Foundation. January 28 2013. <http://archive.randi.org/site/index.php/swift-blog/2000-child-witch-killings-and-africans.html>. CM

There is need for an intensive public enlightenment campaign to get **people** in northern Ghana to abandon the superstitious belief that **associate**s **disability with withcraft and magic**. **People** need to be educated to act and **react with** care and compassion, not **irrational fear**, **to** any form of **disability or ‘abnormality**’ in children or in any other human being. But this much needed awareness program cannot happen due to lack of principled stance on the witchcraft phenomena. Witchcraft is a charged and controversial topic. And many locals do not like tinkering with it. There are too many people; local chiefs, priests, soothsayers, etc. with vested interest in witchcraft belief and practice. Those trying to combat witchcraft related abuse are mainly faith based organisations like the one managing this orphanage or religious individuals who actually believe in witchcraft. They do not openly question or are willing to challenge witch beliefs.∂ For instance, two NGOs working to address the problem in the region stated in their brochure that they ‘do not challenge the existence or otherwise of witchcraft and its effects on individuals and communities’. It is difficult to understand how these organisations can execute a comprehensive and effective campaign without challenging witchcraft claims. Getting the local population to understand that witchcraft is an imaginary crime, a form of superstition, should be a critical part of any efforts or program to tackle and eradicate witch persecution and killing.∂ Apart from public education, victims of witchcraft accusation need practical help and support. Many **children** at this orphanage were born **with deformities** in different parts of their body. Some of them have speaking or hearing difficulties. A few cannot talk, walk or communicate effectively. One child has some problem on the fingers, and another on the toes.∂ One child was born with a sore on one of the legs which has so far defied all the locally available medical care. Some of the children at the center will eventually die if they do not recieve the urgent medical assistance they need in order to survive. Some urgent surgery and medical care could rectify the health problems, ensure their survival and help save their lives. Unfortunately, the required medical expertise is not available in the country. And even if it is available, the local care center cannot afford it.∂ These children **are branded witches** not only **due to** fear and superstition in their families and communities but also due **ignorance** of the medical solutions to their health problems and lack of resources to cater for their needs.∂ Hence, I am using this opportunity to appeal to all well meaning individuals and groups, skeptics and friends out there to come to the aid of these innocent children and others who are suffering **and** dying due to **superstition,** dogma and irrationalism in the region.

#### The aff embraces the narrative of the monstrous as a liberation strategy for women and people with disabilities- we subvert the concept of being “monstrous” and embrace it as a symbol of strength.

**Ruberg:**

Bonnie Ruberg. Girl Power: Women Monsters and Monstrous Women. 1 November 2005. Escapist Magazine. <http://www.escapistmagazine.com/articles/view/video-games/issues/issue_17/105-Women-Monsters-and-Monstrous-Women.4> CM

**Monsters**, by definition, **are altered human beings**. Zombies, for example, fit this mold nicely, as do ghosts and vampires. **Women monsters**, as seen above, **have been altered not just physically, but also ideologically**. **They've changed** themselves **by stepping outside the accepted image of complacent womanhood**. Yet **they possess the remnants of humanity**. **We**, in turn, **see ourselves in the monsters. We begin to understand our own monstrousness, our own departure from the "human**."∂ **Women** gamers **are** in this way also **monsters.** We - indeed, all **intelligent, independent females** - **break the accepted standards of womanhood**. We have defamed our traditional femininity by dabbling in a supposedly male world, that of video games. As many men would readily agree, we have made ourselves a monstrosity. In hopes of fighting this image, **women** have struggled **for years** to convince the gaming industry of our true humanity; they **have sought out power and respect**.∂ Women, of course, have a right to want strong female characters in the games they play. But maybe they've been looking in the wrong places. **What better role model than the monster**, whose ability to incite fear is so powerful it reaches out from the game? In the parallel worlds of survival horror and the gaming industry, both dotted with damsels and heroines, perhaps **it's time to turn and embrace ourselves, the monsters**.

#### My autonomous medical decision is to embrace Magical Feminism and the narrative of the witch. I am resisting the medicalization of my body as a person with a disability and I am rejecting the constructs that the patriarchy places upon me.

Wells:

Kimberly Ann Wells, Screaming, Flying and Laughing: Magical Feminism’s Witches in Contemporary Film, Television, and Novels. May 2007. CM

In her 1984 New York Times review of John Updike’s Witches of Eastwick, Margaret Atwood suggests “What a culture has to say about **witchcraft**, whether in jest∂ or in earnest, **has** a lot **to do with** its views of **sexuality and power**, **and** especially with∂ the **apportioning of powers between the sexes**. **The witches were burned** not because∂ 7∂ they were pitied but **because they were feared**” (3 emphasis mine). Atwood’s∂ comments illustrate that **in examining witches, we participate in the feminist project of**∂ **studying** the “apportioning of powers between the sexes”– how we understand the∂ **connections between gender and power** today, and that much of the current struggle∂ with contemporary women understanding and embracing feminism has to do with fear∂ of change. That old and ugly women are bad witches and beautiful women are good∂ witches reveals the various ways and understandings of witches in fiction provides, as∂ well, an understanding of women within the culture that produces that fiction.∂ Interestingly, Anne Llewelyn Barstow’s pivotal **study of** real women accused as∂ **witches in the sixteenth century argues** that the fact “that European **women** first∂ **emerged into full legal adulthood as witches**, **that they were** first accorded independent∂ legal status in order to be **prosecuted for witchcraft, indicates** both **their vulnerability**∂ **and** the level of **antifeminism in** modern European **society**” (41). This **emergence of**∂ **women as legal entity and witch**, at the same historical moment, also **shows how**∂ strongly **connected the concept of independent woman and** our modern concept of∂ **witch has been** ever since. **Both feminist and witch are scapegoated as evil**, with evil∂ meaning **those who endanger society’s family values** and therefore who **must be**∂ **punished for exercising powers that patriarchy defines as more rightly belonging to**∂ **men**: independence, outspoken belief in oneself, sexual freedom, education, and choice∂ in occupation. **Both groups are women who struggle with patriarchy and power**. Susan∂ 8∂ Faludi traced a backlash in the late 1980s that still seems to grow stronger, partly∂ because while many people believe in the principals of feminism, **many are afraid to**∂ **identify as feminists for fear of that backlash and corresponding “witchhunt**,”∂ represented by the widespread use of denigrating terms like “feminazi” **among** certain∂ **conservative groups**.

#### My advocacy opens the debate space to new voices and challenges the patriarchal order that exists in academic activities. Affirm the metaphor of the witch to deconstruct the negativity that surrounds the notion of being a “monster”- I do not want to fit in because it is the things that make me different that make me powerful.

Wells:

Kimberly Ann Wells, Screaming, Flying and Laughing: Magical Feminism’s Witches in Contemporary Film, Television, and Novels. May 2007. CM

To be a good witch or a bad witch is one of the central questions of popular∂ depictions of the witch, but it is not as simple as one versus the other.3∂ Often, **through**∂ her **challenges to patriarchal order, the witch has been** considered a “bad witch.” But∂ her actions may be seen as **good in a new context**, when **written not by the** victor∂ (**patriarchy**). It is no wonder that **feminists have been** particularly **attracted to** the idea∂ of **the witch as a metaphor to explain** and exalt **the unruly woman for decades**. Xavière∂ Gauthier, in a 1980s introduction to a literary review, dedicated to exploring women’s∂ rebellious, non-conformist creativity titled “Porquoi Sorcières” exclaims:∂ Why witches? Because witches sing. Can I hear this singing? It is the sound∂ of another voice. They tried to make us believe that women did not know how∂ to speak or write; that they were stutterers or mutes. That is because they tried∂ to make women speak straightforwardly, logically, geometrically, in strict∂ conformity. In reality, they croon lullabies, they howl, they gasp, they babble,∂ they shout, they sigh. They are silent, and even their silence can be heard. (199)∂ In her enthusiasm, Gauthier over-essentializes these women as “crooners,” and∂ 9∂ “babblers,” defining them as opposite to a “they” (presumably men and even perhaps∂ non-creative women) who are “logical, straightforward and geometrical.” Gauthier is∂ also very much a part of a particular moment of Second Wave feminism when the∂ French Feminists were exploring ideas that have been a part of the negotiated spaces of∂ “feminisms” since the 1970s. But her over-enthusiasm reveals **the witch’s appeal** for∂ **women interested in breaking patriarchal rules; the witch’s very existence defies**∂ **patriarchy. The** popularly depicted **witch**4∂ **is a woman who breaks rules and threatens**∂ **change**, just **as the feminist wishes** to do. In her analysis of Gauthier’s appropriation∂ of **the witch as feminist,** Naomi Goldenberg claims Gauthier’s enthusiastic use of∂ witches **is a metaphor that connects** the attraction of the **witch’s speech to** the radical∂ unruliness of all creative women, and therefore, making a connection between **the**∂ **magic trans-formative power of the witch** and the creative works written about her:∂ through **the metaphor of witches’ speech**, Gauthier [. . .] **call[s] on the world to**∂ **pay attention** to the new words they want to say– to the words that will be∂ sufficiently deep– in both a psychological and collective sense– that they will∂ sound intoxicating, transformative, crazy, scary, and above all, powerful. [. . .]∂ **Using witchy words as magic words,** that is, as words to make things happen,∂ **was not** an **uncommon** practice **in** 1970s **feminism** (203, emphasis mine).∂ By **placing creativity, power, and feminism in the same categories as witchcraft**, we∂ **define(s) female power**, looking at witches within novels and films that are seen as∂ 10∂ popular women’s texts, a so-called “women’s genre,” and examine how those texts∂ may make change happen. **We examine the “transformative” power of feminism** in an∂ entertaining format. **Magic, in the hands of powerful witches, can change the world**,∂ **just as feminism strives to do**.

# FRONTLINES

## A2 Nebel T

#### Your conception of a “grammatically correct” interpretation of the topic is racist and exclusionary

Niemi 15

Rebar Niemi, debate coach, instructor at NSD and TDC, living K alt. Mr. Nebel’s Neighborhood, OR Nebel Tea- I sip it. September 22 2015. Premier Debate Today. <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/09/22/nebel-t-i-sip-it/>. CM

In one sense we should be thankful that Mr. Nebel has let the cat out of the bag: **T arguments** from the perspective **of correctness have** always **been the vehicle for racism and exclusion** of all sorts. I cannot imagine **a construction of competent english or correct grammar** that **is** not **racialized, gendered, and** further **influenced by its origins**. To me **it is impossible to endorse** the claim to **correctness without conceding** that one is invested in **a justification of domination** (of course they won’t call it that) stretching across axes of class, race, gender, flesh, and cultural origin. The one place where Mr. Nebel speaks to this question, he dismisses it by claiming that specific examples are insufficient to deal with the bare plurality of his arguments. Mr. Nebel is kind to differentiate for us that there is “generic” or “competent” english, and that is its own dialect, where as these other dialects or ways of speaking are simply different uncomparable dialects. This truly tests my credulity**. Are higher pitched so-called “feminine” voices less competent speakers of english?** Are those who have read words in books but never heard them pronounced due to lack of high-grade prep school educations less competent? What about those who speak in accents, vernaculars, or dialects of english? For that matter, what about overlaps and points of connection between those ways of speaking and “generic english?” We can easily assume what Mr. Nebel thinks about speech impediments, or those who are unfamiliar with formal usage of grammar. Perhaps even run on sentences disqualify one from being a competent english speaker? Or an overabundance of rhetorical questions? Does anyone have memorized the full and formal set of rules for speaking competent or proper english? Does anyone actually trust that all those rules aren’t implicitly ideological? It is hard to believe that Mr. Nebel is blind to the values he endorses. Perhaps we should accurately hold him to them.

The idea of a “correct” grammar or way of speaking english is constructed by those with privilege and excludes voices who use a different dialect- this turns your appeal to fairness and education because you appeal to the white notion of these concepts. Fairness is constructed by the privileged voices.

**Their use of theory is part and parcel of the problem that the 1AC points out.** Their ruse of [education/fairness] is being used to shift discourse away from my advocacy, in the same way that the state uses appeals to the ethical to shift discourse away from their oppressive policies.

#### Claims of fairness and objectivity are ways to silence our voices.

**Delgado**

Richard Delgado, Law Professor at University of Colorado. Shadowboxing: An Essay on Power. Cornell Law Review, Vol. 77, No. 4, Art. 2. May 1992. <http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3525&context=clr>. CM

**We have** cleverly **built power's view of the appropriate standard** of conduct **into the** very **term fair.** Thus, **the stronger party is able to have** his/**her way and see her**/him**self as principled** at the same time.Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach** is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it **is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who** centuries ago **found** himself in **a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about** administrability, **fairness,** stability, and ease of determination **points us away from what** [\*821] really counts: **the way** in which **stronger parties** have managed to **inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture**, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

**Specifically, the law is created to curtail the options of the disabled body. Any praxis we take is delegitimized because it’s not rational or good enough. I am a disabled body. Telling me how I can engage in my personal praxis is demeaning and is the exact logic I am criticizing. That means your performance links into the role of the ballot- you act like the state, regulating what actions are right and wrong and attempting to normalize all behavior. You are the power structures I am criticizing at work- which means if I win my criticism your actions are oppressive and should be rejected.**

**If my practice makes things tough for you that’s good- intentionally giving control to those considered underdeveloped and incompetent helps to subvert society’s notions that only the traditional “competent adult” can make QUOTE proper decisions. I’m cripping your notion of fairness and taking it back for myself and the monster. Peace and Roy:**

Peace, William J. and Claire Roy < Visiting Professor, Renee Crown Honors Program, Syracuse University & Parent and Blogger, Life with a Severely Disabled Child>. “Scrutinizing Ashley X: Presumed Medical ‘Solutions’ vs. Real Social Adaptation.” The Journal of Philosophy, Science & Law: Disability Special Issue Volume 14, July 2, 2014, pages 33-52

When one combines physical and cognitive deficits that limit one’s ability to be autonomous with the penchant for non-disabled others to assert their power, it is no wonder people with a disability are socially isolated and stigmatized. Ells maintains, **the challenge for those with a disability is to retain**, regain, or re-configuresubstantial **autonomy despite** autonomy loss brought on by the conditions of impairmentor **the condition of one’s social situation**… This struggle often involves grappling with barriers in housing, transportation, employment, rehabilitation, technology, education and the physical environment that interfere with acting independently” (Ells 2001, 606). **The efforts of people with a disability to be autonomous will always fail if they are expected** to aspire **to be typical,** specifically by using bipedal locomotion and without cognitive deficits. **It is** thus **more empowering to reject accepted beliefs associated with autonomy** (the struggle for independence) **and** insteadembrace situated autonomy. The fact is **[that] all people with a disability can be independent to a degree** within the confines of one’s socially constructed space. When one situates autonomy in a socio-cultural context, many possibilities are created that are not usually associated with autonomy. Ells has observed that “Access to social spaces and services and empowering relationships makes autonomy possible. In other words, situated independence is necessary to achieve the control necessary for governance” (Ells 2001, 606). The concept of situated autonomy is at odds with the larger social perception of autonomy as defined by Tom Beauchamp and James Childress (1994) in health care. As we understand Beauchamp and Childress, an autonomous person is one who freely acts in accordance with a self-chosen plan. Thus **autonomy is the personal rule of the self that is free from controlling interferences by others and from personal limitations that prevent meaningful choice.**

## A2 T Resolved

**Their use of theory is part and parcel of the problem that the 1AC points out.** Their ruse of [education/fairness] is being used to shift discourse away from my advocacy, in the same way that the state uses appeals to the ethical to shift discourse away from their oppressive policies.

#### Claims of fairness and objectivity are ways to silence our voices.

**Delgado**

Richard Delgado, Law Professor at University of Colorado. Shadowboxing: An Essay on Power. Cornell Law Review, Vol. 77, No. 4, Art. 2. May 1992. <http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3525&context=clr>. CM

**We have** cleverly **built power's view of the appropriate standard** of conduct **into the** very **term fair.** Thus, **the stronger party is able to have** his/**her way and see her**/him**self as principled** at the same time.Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach** is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it **is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who** centuries ago **found** himself in **a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about** administrability, **fairness,** stability, and ease of determination **points us away from what**[\*821] really counts: **the way** in which **stronger parties** have managed to **inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture**, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

**Specifically, the law is created to curtail the options of the disabled body. Any praxis we take is delegitimized because it’s not rational or good enough. I am a disabled body. Telling me how I can engage in my personal praxis is demeaning and is the exact logic I am criticizing. That means your performance links into the role of the ballot- you act like the state, regulating what actions are right and wrong and attempting to normalize all behavior. You are the power structures I am criticizing at work- which means if I win my criticism your actions are oppressive and should be rejected.**

**If my practice makes things tough for you that’s good- intentionally giving control to those considered underdeveloped and incompetent helps to subvert society’s notions that only the traditional “competent adult” can make QUOTE proper decisions. I’m cripping your notion of fairness and taking it back for myself and the monster. Peace and Roy:**

Peace, William J. and Claire Roy < Visiting Professor, Renee Crown Honors Program, Syracuse University & Parent and Blogger, Life with a Severely Disabled Child>. “Scrutinizing Ashley X: Presumed Medical ‘Solutions’ vs. Real Social Adaptation.” The Journal of Philosophy, Science & Law: Disability Special Issue Volume 14, July 2, 2014, pages 33-52

When one combines physical and cognitive deficits that limit one’s ability to be autonomous with the penchant for non-disabled others to assert their power, it is no wonder people with a disability are socially isolated and stigmatized. Ells maintains, **the challenge for those with a disability is to retain**, regain, or re-configuresubstantial **autonomy despite** autonomy loss brought on by the conditions of impairmentor **the condition of one’s social situation**… This struggle often involves grappling with barriers in housing, transportation, employment, rehabilitation, technology, education and the physical environment that interfere with acting independently” (Ells 2001, 606). **The efforts of people with a disability to be autonomous will always fail if they are expected** to aspire **to be typical,** specifically by using bipedal locomotion and without cognitive deficits. **It is** thus **more empowering to reject accepted beliefs associated with autonomy** (the struggle for independence) **and** insteadembrace situated autonomy. The fact is **[that] all people with a disability can be independent to a degree** within the confines of one’s socially constructed space. When one situates autonomy in a socio-cultural context, many possibilities are created that are not usually associated with autonomy. Ells has observed that “Access to social spaces and services and empowering relationships makes autonomy possible. In other words, situated independence is necessary to achieve the control necessary for governance” (Ells 2001, 606). The concept of situated autonomy is at odds with the larger social perception of autonomy as defined by Tom Beauchamp and James Childress (1994) in health care. As we understand Beauchamp and Childress, an autonomous person is one who freely acts in accordance with a self-chosen plan. Thus **autonomy is the personal rule of the self that is free from controlling interferences by others and from personal limitations that prevent meaningful choice.**

ALSO on your textuality standard:

Turn- there are nonbinary interpretations of correctness- your standards appeal to a false notion of there only being one “correct interp”

Niemi 15:

Rebar Niemi, debate coach, instructor at NSD and TDC, living K alt. Mr. Nebel’s Neighborhood, OR Nebel Tea- I sip it. September 22 2015. Premier Debate Today. <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/09/22/nebel-t-i-sip-it/>. CM

**There is a distinction between T on** the basis of **correctness** (**semantics**, etc.) **and T on** the basis of **better debating** (pragmatics). We should **sever the link between correctness and better debating** fundamentally. **Better debating is** a contextually defined (and non-static) method of **evaluating performances** in round. **Correctness is an appeal to right answers** and wrong persons. **Correctness is an appeal to logic** that is unbound by its history, creators, or usage – logic that grounds itself in so-called “universality.” **Though** this may come as a shock, **there are non-binary conceptions of truth and falsity**. Even more shockingly, there are multiple types and expressions of logic. Throughout this article I will refer to the position that semantics control or come before pragmatic concerns as the position of correctness. This article’s thesis is that students have been increasingly using some of Jake Nebel’s recent spate of articles (*Should T be a voting issue?, Specifying just governments,*and *On the priority of resolutional semantics*) to justify a certain type of topicality position. Each of these articles centers the notion of the “competent speaker of english” without ever justifying why we should value that or really what the implications of such a designation are. This is a rebuttal to Mr. Nebel’s overarching position on debate, an indict of the ethics of such a position, and a suggestion that **students should dispense with the utilization of this evidence for theoretical debates**.